

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 6-14, and 17-20 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 8, 12, 19, and 20. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In response to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, Applicants have deleted the “image data deletion module” from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-14, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Gassho et al.* (“*Gassho*”) (US 2002/0060806 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Gassho* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 12, as amended herein.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 12 to distinguish the claimed subject matter from that shown in the *Gassho* reference. The *Gassho* reference discloses the feature of copying one print job to both a mother job and a daughter job, and then discarding either the copied print job in the mother job or that in the daughter job. On the other hand, in the presently claimed subject matter, redundant image data is deleted and the remaining image data is shared by multiple print jobs.

Further, the *Gassho* reference neither discloses nor suggests the presently claimed feature of changing an execution status of a print job in the printed status among the print jobs stored in the job storage module, from a ‘printed status’ to a ‘print queuing status,’ so that the print job in the printed state is to be reprinted by a users’s request.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the *Gassho* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 12.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 12, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Gassho*. Claims 2, 3, and 6-11, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, and claims 13, 14, and 17-20, each of which ultimately depends from claim 12, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Gassho* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-3, 6-14, and 17-20, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ITECP014).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Customer Number 25920